

IFRT Plenary Meeting #12

[IFRT PLENARY MEETING](#), 26 MAY 2020

Review Team Members: If you have corrections, please email Amy at amy.creamer@icann.org

Agenda:

1. Welcome
2. Agenda Bashing
3. Administrative Items
4. Interview the CSC: Lars-Johan Liman (Chair) and Brett Carr (co-Chair)
5. Proposal to hold four (4) working sessions divided by topic
6. Next Meetings:
 - a. 09 June
 - b. 23 June

High Level Notes

Interviewing the CSC

The following questions AND answers, have been put into the [IANA CONTRACT BREAKDOWN spreadsheet](#).

Summarized/para-phrased answers from Liman and Brett, Chair & Co-Chair of the CSC are in red

IANA NAMING FUNCTIONS CONTRACT SECTION https://pti.icann.org/agreements	QUESTIONS TO THE CSC (FROM THE IANA NAMING FUNCTIONS REVIEW TEAM)
Article IV, Section 4.3 (d): Scope of the IANA Naming Function Provision of other services and implementation of modifications in performance of the IANA Naming Function, in each case upon ICANN's request and in conformance with applicable policies and procedures.	1. Does the CSC believe there are processes to address each area where performance of the IANA Naming functions might require changes? ANSWER: Yes. 2. For modification processes that do exist (relevant to the CSC is the SLA change procedure) are you satisfied with the procedure? Has the procedure been invoked and was it successful?

	<p>ANSWER: When it was determined that SLAs needed to be modified, it took a long time to create the SLA Change Procedure. We reported about the process on our CSC monthly report. Now that there is a procedure, making the SLA changes have commenced.</p>
<p>Article VII, Section 7.2: Performance Monitoring</p> <p>a. So long as the CSC exists pursuant to ICANN’s Bylaws, Contractor acknowledges and agrees that the CSC is entitled to monitor Contractor’s performance under this Contract (including the SOW) in accordance with ICANN’s Bylaws.</p> <p>b. Contractor shall provide reports to the CSC as contemplated by the SOW.</p> <p>c. Contractor shall act in good faith to resolve issues identified by the CSC.</p> <p>d. Contractor acknowledges that the CSC shall be empowered to escalate identified areas of concern as set forth in ARTICLE VIII.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Annex A, 3 (b): Monthly Performance Progress Report</p> <p>Contractor shall prepare and submit reports as mutually agreed between Contractor and the CSC.</p>	<p>3. Does the CSC believe it receives reports covering all performance areas within the CSC's remit?</p> <p>ANSWER: Yes, and it is actually too much information with some metrics that are unnecessary for the CSC’s purpose. The CSC is concerned that tracking too many metrics could be a burden to PTI and not be providing any value [note - PTI now has an automated system that tracks and publishes these metrics]. The CSC is learning which metrics to skip in order to pay attention to the most important metrics. [note - Peter stated he preferred more metrics to less]</p> <p>4. Does ICANN/PTI respond to any report changes that the CSC has ever requested in order to ensure the reports cover the IANA Naming function performance accurately.</p> <p>ANSWER: There has been little need to ask for changes, but on 2 occasions the CSC asked for information to be presented differently and PTI responded immediately.</p> <p>5. Has PTI provided the CSC with reports that enable the CSC to fulfill its remit and this section of the contract?</p> <p>ANSWER: Yes. But the CSC has also been discussing areas in the IANA contract that are not being monitored, and discussing if we need new metrics.</p> <p>6. Are the reports provided in a timely manner?</p> <p>ANSWER: Yes, and PTI works very hard to get us the reports before their due date when the CSC needs them early for a face-to-face meeting. The report has never been late.</p>

	<p>7. Has the CSC needed to in-act the Remedial Action Procedure (called RAPs, this is the escalation process), and if so, how did PTI (& ICANN) react?</p> <p>ANSWER: There has been no cause to utilize the RAPs; no systemic issues.</p> <p>8. Has the CSC found other issues not covered by the Remedial Action Procedure, that required PTI's (& ICANN's) response? If so, what are the details?</p> <p>ANSWER: The SLA changes are the only thing.</p>
<p>Article VIII, Section 8.1: Complaint Resolution Process</p> <p>(a) If Contractor receives a customer service complaint from a customer (a "Complaint"), Contractor will review the Complaint and attempt to resolve it to the reasonable satisfaction of the person or entity who brought the Complaint (the "Complainant") as soon as reasonably practicable. If the Complaint is not so resolved, the Complainant may escalate the matter in writing to Contractor's management team, in which case Contractor shall notify the CSC. If the Complaint is still not resolved, the Complainant or the President of Contractor may escalate the matter in writing to ICANN's Ombudsman.</p> <p>(b) If (i) a Complainant is a customer and (ii) after completing the escalation process provided for in Section 8.1(a), the Complaint is still not resolved, then (A) the CSC may conduct a review to determine whether the Complaint is subject of a persistent performance issue of Contractor or an indication of a systemic problem with Contractor's performance of the IANA Naming</p>	<p>9. Have known customer complaints been resolved to the CSC's satisfaction?</p> <p>ANSWER: Individual customer complaints and escalations, go through PTI's customer complaint process, not to the CSC. The CSC would only escalate using the RAPs if a systemic problem was noted within the customer escalations. The CSC is made aware of all customer escalations by PTI, so that the CSC can monitor for determining if there are systemic issues. To date, the CSC has never needed to utilize the RAPs.</p> <p>The CSC frequently gets customers coming directly to them and the CSC redirects them to PTI's process.</p> <p>10. What types of complaints has the CSC received?</p> <p>ANSWER: See answer to #9</p> <p>11. Has the CSC uncovered any systemic problems with the IANA Naming Function services through these complaints? If so, did PTI fix this issue?</p> <p>ANSWER: see answer to #9</p>

<p>Function pursuant to the terms of this Contract (a “Performance Issue”) and (B) the Complainant may (x) request mediation, which shall be conducted in a manner consistent with the terms and process set forth below in Section 8.1(c) and (y) if the issue is not resolved following such mediation and the Complaint meets the requirements of the Independent Review Process, initiate an Independent Review Process (as defined in the ICANN’s Bylaws). If the CSC determines that a Performance Issue exists, the CSC may seek remediation of the Performance Issue through the IANA Problem Resolution Process described in Section 8.2.</p> <p>(c) Customer Mediation Process. Etc. etc.</p>	
<p>Article IX, Section 9.3: Transition</p> <p>(a) Contractor shall develop and maintain, with ICANN input, a plan in place for transitioning the IANA Naming Function to a successor provider to ensure an orderly transition while maintaining continuity and security of operations, including in connection with the nonrenewal of this Contract and/or divestiture or other reorganization of PTI by ICANN as contemplated by ICANN’s Bylaws. The transition plan shall be submitted to ICANN and posted to the IANA Website within 18 months after the Effective Date. The plan shall thereafter be reviewed annually and updated as appropriate.</p>	<p>12. Has the CSC reviewed PTI's Transition Plan, the plan to transition IANA services to another entity?</p> <p>No, as it is not mentioned in the CSC’s Charter. Partly because the CSC is clearly tasked, in their Charter, with continuing to monitor whichever entity performs the IANA Naming Functions...so if the Transition plan was invoked, the CSC would retain their same roll. However, it is a gap between the CSC Charter and the IANA Contract.</p> <p>Further discussion regarding the wording of “(d) ICANN, in conjunction with the CSC as necessary, shall review the transition plan at least every five years.”</p> <p>Kim Davies: PTI interprets this as that PTI must submit/update a Transition plan every five years, but the CSC’s role is “as necessary”, meaning they are not required to review it but only if necessary. However there is no definition of “necessary” so it may be worthwhile to understand what the community believes to be “necessary”.</p>

<p>(b) Contractor shall provide support and cooperation to ICANN, and to any successor provider of the IANA Naming Function, in order to effect an orderly, stable, secure and efficient transition of the performance of the IANA Naming Function.</p> <p>(c) Contractor agrees to be engaged in the transition plan and to provide appropriate transition staff and expertise to facilitate a stable and secure transition of the IANA Naming Function to a successor provider.</p> <p>(d) ICANN, in conjunction with the CSC as necessary, shall review the transition plan at least every five years.</p>	<p>James: believes the community expects the Transition Plan to be published</p>
---	--

DISCUSSION AFTER COMPLETING THE ABOVE QUESTIONS:

LIMAN: CSC continues to explore other areas that might fall in our remit. Most recently discussing DNSSEC and what would objective measurements be? Also emergency procedures. But this is on hold and will resume discussions [in the Fall]

LIMAN/BRETT: review ICANN Bylaws 18.2: SPECIAL IFRS. a(i) and a(ii) each describe two differently named procedures but both are the same. Keep the wording in a(i), and eliminate a(ii)

IFRT WORK: WORKING SESSIONS

- proposal to hold 4 working sessions: each session will have a specific subject, cover specific parts of the contract, and only require 3 to 4 team members to attend based on the contract sections they signed up for. ICANN & PTI will be available to answer questions during the working session with the goal of members actually writing and finishing their review sections

#1: SOC2 and CCOP Review & Audits – signed NDA required to attend

AUDIENCE: Fred, Tomslin, Andreas & James

#2: Root Zone Management Review without SOC2 AND Computing Systems without SOC2

AUDIENCE: Fred, Peter, Rick, James, J.C.

[#3: SECURITY \(SOC2 Meeting must commence before this\) & Transition Plan](#)

AUDIENCE: Fred & Rick, maybe Suzanna

[#4: .int](#)

AUDIENCE: Tomslin, Peter, James

DOODLE POLL: <https://doodle.com/poll/vhuuyw5padh2rxeb>

Decisions:

N/A

Action Items:

For Team Members: please respond to this Doodle Poll:

<https://doodle.com/poll/vhuuyw5padh2rxeb>